

### REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 2-13, 15-18, and 26-37. Claims 2-4, 8-10, and 26-28 have been amended. Claims 31-37 have been added. Claims 1, 14, and 19-25 have been cancelled, without prejudice. The specification has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

#### 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. Claim 1 has been cancelled, without prejudice. As such, the rejection is moot.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-9, 19-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoover et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,560,005 (hereinafter Hoover). Claims 1 and 19-24 have been cancelled, without prejudice. As such, the rejection to these claims is moot. The rejection to Claims 2-9 and 28 is respectfully traversed, for the reasons below.

Amended Claim 3 recites, in part:

- f) storing in a cache said set of information which was requested by said application program; and
- g) if a pre-determined time has passed since said set of information was accessed, removing said set of information from said cache.

Claim 3 recites that the requested information is stored and then removed, if the information is not accessed in a pre-determined amount of time.

Hoover fails to teach or suggest that the requested information is stored and then removed, if the information is not accessed in a pre-determined amount of time.

#### CLAIM 6

Claim 6 recites in part:

said update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of said application program, said activity being related to said information.

Claim 6 recites that one of the fields is updated by writing to a database, based upon monitoring the user's activity. It is respectfully asserted that Hoover fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. As such, allowance of Claim 6 is respectfully submitted.

The rejection cites Hoover at col. 53, lines 23-27 with respect to the limitations of Claim 6. Applicants do not understand this passage of Hoover to teach or suggest monitoring user activity. Rather, the passage is concerns issuing a 'get' message to retrieve demographic data. Applicants do not understand this to be monitoring the user's activity, as claimed. As such, allowance of Claim 6 is respectfully submitted.

#### CLAIM 8

Claim 8 recites, in part:

providing a parameter to said application program that is used to track active user records; and

receiving said parameter from said application program in order to track a user record associated with said call.

Amended Claim 8 recites a limitation of a parameter used to track active user records is given to the application program. Claim 8 further recites a limitation of “receiving the parameter from the application program in order to track a user record associated with the call.”

It is respectfully asserted that Hoover fails to teach or suggest this limitation of Claim 8. Hoover may teach that the application program passes an argument in a call; however, Applicants do not understand Hoover to teach or suggest “receiving the parameter from the application program in order to track a user record associated with the call,” as claimed. Nor does Hoover teach or suggest that the parameter used to track active user records is provided to the application program, as claimed. As such, allowance of Claim 8 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 28 depend from Claim 3, which is believed to be allowable. As such, Claims 2, 4-9, and 28 are believed to be allowable.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-18, 25-27, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,085,976 (hereinafter, Sehr) in view of Hoover. Claims 14 and 25 have been cancelled, without prejudice. As such, the rejection to Claims 14 and 25 is moot. The rejection

to Claims 10-13, 15-18, 26-27, and 29-30 is respectfully traversed, for the reasons below.

CLAIMS 10-13, 15-18, and 29-30

Currently Amended Claim 10 recites, in part:

said program further operable to store said retrieved information and to remove said retrieved information if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time.

Amended Claim 10 recites that the program further operable to store said retrieved information and to remove said retrieved information if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time.

Sehr fails to teach or suggest storing the retrieved information and removing the retrieved information if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time.

Hoover fails to remedy this deficiency in Sehr. Thus, the combination of Sehr and Hoover fail to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. As neither Sehr nor Hoover teach or suggest this claimed limitation.

For the foregoing rationale, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious over Sehr in view of Hoover. As such, allowance of Claim 10 is respectfully submitted.

CLAIMS 26 and 27

Claim 26 recites, in part:

means for storing said requested set of information and removing said requested set of information if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 10, the combination of Sehr and Hoover fail to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. Thus, Claim 26 is not rendered obvious over Sehr in view of Hoover. As such, allowance of Claim 26 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 11-13, 15-18, and 29-30 depend from Claim 10, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance Claims 11-13, 15-18, and 29-30 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 27 depend from Claim 26, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance of Claim 27 is earnestly solicited.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-13, 15-18, and 26-37 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 2-13, 15-18, and 26-37 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 10/14, 2003

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Ronald M. Pomeroy  
Ronald M. Pomeroy  
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile